

## Book Reviews

*Drug War Heresies: Learning from Other Vices, Times, and Places.* Robert J. MacCoun and Peter Reuter. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2001. 479 pp. \$25.00 (paper).

*Markets and Moral Regulation: Cultural Change in the European Union.* Paulette Kurzer. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2001. 210 pp. \$54.95 (cloth), \$19.95 (paper).

The regulation of morals is a ubiquitous feature of how sovereignty and citizenship interact. Liberal-democratic citizenship regimes provide universal rights and formal access to political participation. Sovereignty, however, continues to entail the prerogative for the liberal-democratic state to sanction certain modes of individual behavior. Policies to regulate morals may be adopted for paternalistic reasons, or because they protect the community from harm, rather than to impose collective norms on individuals. Practically, such sanctions marginalize classes of citizens to a renegade status, regardless of their justification.

No better example of this phenomenon exists than the regulation of illegal drug consumption and distribution. What do we know about this particular exercise of sovereignty? What are the politics of regulating the personal behavior of individuals and commerce that surrounds dubious personal choices? What effects do such choices have not only on the reduction of harm to individuals and the communities they partially comprise, but the definition of citizenship? For those interested in such broad questions, these two books—very different in character, but each excellent in its own fashion—provide important reading.

*Drug War Heresies*, by Robert J. MacCoun and Peter Reuter, offers a comprehensive and painstaking assessment of governmental efforts to influence the use of illicit drugs. MacCoun and Reuter both worked on drug policy issues for the RAND Corporation for several years, and the authors' book brings with it the authority of RAND's extensive work on this topic. The purpose of their book, as they clearly state, is to point a direction for drug policy in the United States. Their book is precisely the kind of product that people generally assume policy experts produce but that such experts rarely do. MacCoun and Reuter summarize and evaluate a massive amount of information. They look at the experience of industrialized nations in regulating drug and alcohol consumption. They carefully assess the different moral perspectives that stand behind such efforts at social control, and they do so with the practical goal in mind of trying to identify optimal policy strategies.

Both the breadth and the depth of the policies the authors evaluate are impressive. Since their book is unapologetically focused on the United States, they look at data on the impact of various drug-enforcement regimes at both the state and the federal levels. They appraise the evidence available about the history of prohibition regimes, not only for illicit drugs but also for alcohol. And they do not stop there. They also consider the approaches to the regulation of illicit drugs in

various wealthy societies. As one might expect, given its controversial status, they pay special attention to the Dutch experience.

The authors focus throughout on drawing careful conclusions about the harms and benefits different policy regimes provide. They convincingly conclude that the harsh prohibitionist regime pursued in the United States fails at harm reduction. On balance, there is no evidence that harsh penalties effectively reduce the amount of drug consumption. Further, such a harsh prohibitionist regime causes problems of its own that may intensify the costs to both individuals and society for engaging in illicit drug consumption. Libertarians and others who advocate complete legalization of illicit drugs will find some disappointing conclusions, however. The authors argue that complete liberalization would be irresponsible, too.

The Dutch case is instructive in this respect. Although the Netherlands never completely legalized marijuana, it did pursue an openly tolerant policy toward it. This was coupled with a general strategy of harm reduction for drugs, meaning that the Dutch emphasized education, treatment, and a milder set of sanctions for those caught up in heavy drug usage than that present in most comparable states. The authors convincingly show that this tolerant cannabis regime did not result in increasing consumption of the drug and succeeded in reducing the social harm done to consumers and those around them. They emphasize that the real spike in marijuana consumption, as well as the externalities associated with use of heavier drugs, came later, from the commercialization of cannabis, resulting in the Netherlands becoming known regionally as a drug haven. This experience conforms to the evidence the authors cite from the repeal of prohibition in the United States. The best evidence suggests that the repeal of prohibition did not result in an increase in alcohol consumption or the problems associated with heavy drinking. Instead, it was the long-term impact of commercialization that led to a gradual rise in alcohol problems. The externalities of tolerant drug policies come, not from legal or quasilegal availability, but from commercialization in free-market settings.

What are these authors saying that drug policy should look like? They draw their conclusions with nuance. Their moral framework (consequentialist, if not utilitarian) suggests that harm reduction should be the key. To accomplish this, policy-makers should look at the actual effects of drugs on their users. The accumulated evidence shows that cannabis has remarkably different effects on those who use it than do harder drugs, such as cocaine and heroin. Possession, home production, and friendly sharing of cannabis could well be tolerated without great ill effect as long as the promotion and distribution of the drug are not commercialized. Such tolerance would clearly be inappropriate for more harmful substances. The authors emphasize that treatment, a public-health approach, and other harm-reduction strategies would have a greater impact on harm than stiff criminal penalties, source control, and interdiction, even for more dangerous drugs.

Anyone seeking the first primer on the empirical evidence relevant to assessing the impact of drug policies would do well to start with the MacCoun and Reuter book. The main features of this book that will make it absolutely central to anyone trying to understand drug policy is the enormous amount of evidence presented and the carefully drawn conclusions based on it that the authors offer. No one can be literate on the issue of drug policy, from just about any disciplinary perspective, without familiarizing himself or herself with this volume.

What MacCoun and Reuter's book does not do is explain why what their analysis shows are dubious strategies retain such strong support. It assiduously

refrains from explaining the politics that produce the policies it evaluates. Paulette Kurzer's *Markets and Moral Regulation* comes in here. It is an excellent example of how comparative public policy can be done. First, the book is good social science. From that standpoint, it would be useful for advanced undergraduates and beginning graduate students simply as an example of how empirical evidence compiled in the form of comparative case studies can be used to draw careful conclusions about complex public matters. One of the great strengths of Kurzer's well-written and well-researched book is that she draws subtle conclusions that go no further than what the evidence bears. While such modesty may keep this book from seeming to be a great breakthrough in the comparative public policy literature, it serves as an excellent example of the state of the art for such research. Comparative public policy specialists who focus on moral regulation—and especially drug policy—need to pay attention to this book. It joins such recent works as Richard Friman's *Narcodiplomacy* as an important contribution to our understanding of how international politics contributes to domestic social control and citizenship regimes.

Kurzer looks at four instances of European states pursuing unusual policies that regulate the moral conduct of their citizens. Three of the cases involve states pursuing regimes that are harsher than those of their neighbors. Both Finland and Sweden have long pursued a policy that strictly regulates the distribution of alcohol, with the overt goal of reducing its consumption. The Republic of Ireland has long outlawed abortion and even prevented its citizens from seeking abortions outside of the country. This is part of a broader Irish approach to regulating reproduction and sexuality, which is closely aligned with the teachings of the Catholic Church. Kurzer also looks at Dutch drug policy. In this case, one sees a European state that takes a more tolerant attitude toward personal conduct than do its neighbors.

The main thesis is as follows: Each of these cases deviates from the European norm. Each entails an occurrence of a nation-state pursuing a unique policy, in part due to a shared concept—at least among elites—of its unique national identity. Since these policies are so closely aligned with what state actors and other societal elites take to be the core identity of the respective nations, each has aggressively defended its prerogative to maintain these policies, even as it has integrated into the broader European community. Yet each policy regime moves toward the European norm over time. Kurzer argues that this normalization process is not merely a matter of social diffusion, or even direct pressure from the European Union (EU). Rather, it is the free movement of people and goods that undermines the autonomous policy regime of each of these nation-states. European integration allows choices to arise for citizens that, in turn, generate externalities too great to be ignored. Given the close identification state actors and other elites have with their initial policies, they do not abandon their unique courses gladly, or ever completely. Still, Kurzer persuasively argues that the creation of an integrated market, premised on free trade and the movement of peoples, provides subtle but real pressures for national policy-makers to converge toward an emerging European mean. She shows that redrawing the lines of sovereignty through the EU creates fluidity in the definitions of national identity and citizenship in unanticipated and indirect ways.

The Dutch have recently been reducing their level of toleration for cannabis consumption and distribution. If one were to imagine a domestic economy closed off from externalities, the Dutch policy might be ideal. As sovereignty is somewhat diminished by the EU, Dutch policy-makers have had to consider reasserting a more stringent control on their citizens' use and distribution of marijuana

due to market externalities. Kurzer's book and MacCoun and Reuter's volume reach complimentary conclusions about Dutch drug policy. Kurzer considers little hard empirical evidence about drug usage, but much about the externalities associated with commercialization as it was unleashed by the increasing integration of the European economy. MacCoun and Reuter do not note the broader political and economic context in which commercialization took place, nor the important role played by the Netherlands' neighbors in redrawing its policy. Together, the books show that externalities generated by free trade have pressured the Dutch toward stronger efforts at social control.

Despite the achievement that each of these books represents, taken together they raise more questions than they answer. MacCoun and Reuter's rationalism will make all but the most passionately committed wonder at the tenacity of the harsh prohibitionism pursued by the United States and, in a less extreme form, by many other states. Kurzer gives us a clear explanation for why unique social control policies shift on the margins in the face of market and political integration, and she hints at sources for the tenacity of state actors and other elite actors to maintain preferred policies. Her explanations for where such policies come from in the first place and the mechanisms that reinforce them over time, such that they become part of a collective sense of a shared identity, go little further than asserting constructivist origins and institutional reinforcement—not a position with which most comparativists will disagree, but not a stunning one, either. As suggested, one way of approaching this broader question would be to situate moral regulation in the dynamic interaction of sovereignty and citizenship. To do so would suggest from the outset that the practical realities of citizenship are not comprised solely of civil rights and liberties, and that domestic citizenship regimes should always be expected to face challenges from shifting international settings. As useful and accomplished as these books are, they only scratch the surface of the dynamics of policies regulating personal moral conduct.

#### REFERENCES

Friman, H. Richard. 1996. *Narcodiplomacy: Exporting the U.S. War on Drugs*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

KEITH FITZGERALD, *New College of Florida*

*How Governments Privatize: The Politics of Divestment in the United States and Germany*. Mark Cassell. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press, 2002. 296 pp. \$59.95 (cloth).

In this book, Mark Cassell examines the politics, behavior, and outcomes of two public bureaucracies engaged in historically uncommon but profound projects: The Resolution Trust Corporation (RTC), charged with selling off nearly one-half trillion dollars in failed savings and loan assets; and the *Treuhandanstalt* (THA), charged with privatizing the East Germany economy after reunification. Among the many questions Cassell pursues, two of the bigger ones are: how does national context matter in shaping the outcomes of public agencies? and what are the consequences of using market mechanisms in the public sector?

Cassell's choosing to compare the RTC and the THA—two short-lived agencies in different countries—is unusual, intriguing, and, most importantly, productive. The effectiveness of the comparison rests, to a great degree, on the striking similarity between the two agencies. Both agencies were charged with

privatizing a massive amount of assets; both were public-private hybrid agencies that developed similar internal dynamics and bureaucratic cultures; both were given ancillary goals that often stood in conflict with the privatization goal; both ultimately gave much greater priority to privatization and succeeded unequivocally in achieving this in narrow terms. And, more shockingly, both agencies shut themselves down once this task was completed. What makes the comparison most interesting is that these two agencies performed very similarly but within very different national contexts. But this does not lead to the conclusion that national context does not matter. Indeed, Cassell argues for the opposite.

In explaining the original design, development, and behavior of these two agencies, Cassell follows a multilayered approach. In other words, causal factors are at work on several different levels. Implicitly, he is utilizing an institutional rational-choice model, in that actor behavior is a function of institutionally created incentives (and he often invokes principal-agent theory). The four layers Cassell analyzes include: (1) administrative characteristics; (2) the political environment; (3) the task environment; and (4) the national institutional setting.

Cassell focuses on personnel policies, organizational culture, and organizational structure as the administrative characteristics with the greatest impact on agency outcomes. In these dimensions, the RTC and the THA were very similar organizations. Both had relatively flat internal hierarchies and were loosely organized; authority and power were highly decentralized; both hired on an ad hoc basis and made extensive use of outside contractors; there was little training or socialization of employees, and pay systems were highly incentive-oriented (with privatization sales the chief yardstick); their organizational cultures were heavily influenced by the private sector mentality brought in by private sector experts; and both broke (to varying degrees) from their respective traditional national models of public administration. Among other things, these administrative characteristics fostered a heavy emphasis on rapid privatization over other goals and weakened oversight and accountability.

The second layer consists of the formal institutional mechanisms adopted by political leaders to constrain and control the two organizations. Cassell argues that leaders in both countries established "scapegoat governance" mechanisms: they created an elaborate network of controls that gave them control over the agencies' central management while providing enough obfuscation to allow them to distance themselves from the agencies' actions, thus setting up the agencies to take the brunt of public disgruntlement whenever it arose. The real drawback (or beauty, depending on one's perspective) of this process was that accountability suffered, and the ability of groups to influence the agencies was greatly reduced. In the case of the THA, it also contributed to substantial problems with fraud.

Cassell terms the third layer the "task environment," by which he means the real challenges, unexpected problems, and turns of events that create contingency in virtually all political processes. Again, for both the THA and the RTC, the originally anticipated pattern of action was befuddled by reality on the ground. The Germans started out thinking they would make money selling off the East German economy; we know now that it has instead cost them hundreds of millions of marks, and the tab is still running. The RTC started out thinking it could follow standard Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation practice and simply sell off whole failed institutions. This quickly proved to be virtually impossible. As a result, both the RTC and the THA became "coping organizations," forced to improvise on the fly. Among other things, this meant that both organizations came to focus on less complicated activities that led to easily measurable outcomes (e.g., assets sold over messy restructuring).

The final layer is the national institutional context. Here we find the greatest divergence between the two organizations, as each was shaped by significantly different contexts. In Germany, corporatist relations between the state and highly organized social groups are the norm. The bureaucracy has much greater discretion in Germany than in the U.S., but the state cedes considerable regulatory and administrative responsibility to selected groups. The policy-making environment is long-term in focus. The U.S. is characterized by interest-group pluralism and a more state-dominated pattern of regulation that reflects a more adversarial relationship between groups and the state. The policy-making environment is short-term in its focus. The interesting conclusion that Cassell draws is that the RTC largely mirrored the characteristics of its national context, while the THA was an uncharacteristically state- (and federally) dominated public agency, and thus at odds with its national context (which helps explain why it was able to privatize surprisingly rapidly).

In the final chapter, Cassell seeks to tease out broader theoretical implications of his study. He does this, first, by constructing a typology of four types of bureaucracy based on two kinds of internal and external environments: strategic bureaucracies, independent bureaucracies, controlled bureaucracies, and competitive controlled bureaucracies. From this typology, he hypothesizes distinct kinds of bureaucratic behavior. Cassell constructs a second typology to suggest "how the temporal orientation of a public agency mixes with the temporal orientation of the policy-making [environment] to produce certain types of behaviors and outcomes" (p. 250).

In the end, Cassell provides us with a rigorously detailed organizational study of two highly interesting public agencies. In doing this he draws heavily on the public-management literature, especially the work of Terry Moe. But Cassell seeks to extend this literature to an analysis of public/private hybrid agencies that, by some accounts, are becoming more common. Cassell's multilayered analysis is sophisticated and carefully thought out. He presents and contextualizes in clear form the myriad forces that undoubtedly shape the behavior of public agencies. The one drawback in this approach is that it leaves us wondering whether all of these factors had equally important effects, whether their impacts upon the agencies changed over time, or whether one layer was indeed much more consequential than the others. Cassell's effort in the last chapter to generalize from the cases by constructing two-dimensional typologies implies that one could indeed distill the multiple causal factors into a more generalized and parsimonious theoretical framework. But this should be viewed less as a criticism of the book than as a marker set by Cassell from which future theoretical work should take off. The "tale of two privatizers" could also have benefited from more extensive discussion of the partisan, executive-legislative, and interest-group politics that surrounded and pervaded them. While Cassell does actually discuss these to a significant degree, there is obviously so much more politics that gets left out. Again, however, this does not detract from the achievements of the book, since incorporating all of the relevant politics would inevitably lead to a much longer book and embody a different set of scholarly objectives than Cassell set for himself. On these chosen objectives, the book hits the mark.

RICHARD DEEG, *Temple University*

*Tobacco Control: Comparative Politics in the United States and Canada.* Donley T. Studlar. Peterborough, Ontario: Broadview Press, 2002. 327 pp. \$19.95 (paper).

In this very well written and groundbreaking study, Donley T. Studlar examines and compares the intense political conflicts over national tobacco policy-making,

especially since 1964, in Canada and the United States. Studlar's primary reason for focusing on the period from 1964 to the present is that 1964 was a benchmark year in which both governments began to increasingly support more vigorous tobacco-control programs, particularly at the federal level. According to Studlar, this upsurge in tobacco control regulatory activity occurred due to the release of the 1964 United States Surgeon General's report, which identified smoking as a cause of lung cancer.

Studlar argues that the making of tobacco policy in Canada and the United States occurred in five distinct and successive waves. The first wave occurred from 1884 to 1914 with the advent of the mass production of cigarettes, along with the rise of American Tobacco Company as a monopoly. From 1914 to 1950, both governments promoted cigarette use, particularly in war efforts. From 1950 to 1965, the promotion of cigarettes began to shift, with a continuing rise in health concerns due to tobacco use. From 1964 to 1984, both governments began to enact and implement, in a limited fashion, a variety of tobacco-control programs. This culminated in the period from 1984 to 2001 with rising public and governmental perception of cigarettes as a social menace and the enactment of more tobacco-control programs.

Explaining and assessing tobacco-control policy-making since 1964 in both countries, Studlar argues that they have significant similarities in key economic and social areas: each country is the other's most important trading partner; they share a language; there is liberal population contact between the two countries; they have similar health problems and smoking rates; both have a tobacco agriculture with similar proportional shares of the agricultural market; both have made similar moves toward preventive anti-smoking programs; and both have experienced declines in smoking that have not significantly harmed tobacco-industry profits. Moreover, each country's tobacco industry has used similar political tactics to influence national legislation. According to Studlar, this has included building political coalitions with allied groups such as the hospitality industry, lobbying, and charitable contributions and sponsorship to build support for the tobacco industry among nonprofit and community groups. Studlar argues that the key difference between the two countries has been that health groups' actions at the national level have been more muted in the United States than in Canada.

Studlar further explains that there have been many similarities in the type and scope of tobacco control policies at the national level in both countries since 1964, including similar tobacco policies in taxation, litigation against tobacco companies, anti-tobacco community-action efforts, health warning labels, and tobacco health research.

The book concludes by arguing that moving tobacco issues onto the public agenda (à la John Kingdon), promoting "healthy public policies" under which tobacco control is primarily a prevention program, and lesson-drawing—in which diffusion of policies occurs between jurisdictions—provide the best explanations for why there is a convergence in United States and Canadian national tobacco-control policies. Studlar further explains that probably the most favorable force for convergence has been the ideological move in both countries towards promoting healthy public policy in conjunction with interest groups and social movements contributing to and advocating for this convergence. However, Studlar also maintains that no single explanation completely dominates, with all three playing a significant role.

Generally, this study is compelling and provides a good description of how tobacco-policy convergence has occurred in both countries. The study is grounded in appropriate current academic public policy (including Kingdon, Sabatier, and Baumgartner and Jones) and applied public policy literature. Indeed, the study's primary emphasis on applied public policy stands among the best assessments

that have ever been written. This study is focused toward both general-interest and academic audiences. It could be used as both an undergraduate and graduate applied-policy text. In addition, the book also provides a practical guide for tobacco-control and health-policy administration professionals in both the United States and Canada.

This study accurately mentions that the tobacco industry's primary policy motivation is to influence the political process at all levels of government by reducing tobacco taxes and weakening or killing vigorous tobacco control regulations. This policy goal has played a crucial role in tobacco-industry activities in both countries. Despite the fact that Studlar does mention this crucial factor in a descriptive sense, one weakness of the study is that it does not take the analysis a step further, considering and assessing whether this variable might be an equally influential factor (in conjunction with the other three top factors) in explaining tobacco-control policy convergence among the countries.

In general, however, *Tobacco Control: Comparative Politics in the United States and Canada* is a very thoroughly researched and written work. It is an important addition to the applied literature of comparative tobacco policy-making, public-health policy, and public policy. This study breaks new ground, which hopefully will inspire others to conduct further studies similar to this very timely and important public-policy analysis.

MICHAEL S. GIVEL, *University of Oklahoma*

*Agir Dans un Monde Incertain: Essai Sur la Démocratie Technique.* Michael Callon, Pierre Lascombes, and Yannick Barthe. Paris: Le Seuil, 2001. 358 pp.

The authors are political scientists interested in public policies. Their previous work focused on issues of public health, the environment, and the sociology of sciences. Elaborating on their previous observations, they consider that governance in the twenty-first century should include additional institutions in order to improve democracy. The question that they address is: when should people be given the authority to participate in decisions that could damage their lives? The core argument is that in developed states, when controversial situations emerge from scientific and technical uncertainty, ordinary citizens have the capacity to improve public decisions.

The authors rely on two hypotheses. First, scientific research cannot give timely, relevant answers to social questions. Because expertise implies simplifications of the real world, it has to be isolated. Accordingly, when non-controversial knowledge is unavailable, scientists lack the capacity to solve sociotechnical problems. Second, affected individuals have a right to speak to the phenomena that they endure. Such is the case for shepherds in Sellafield, U.K. facing the Chernobyl cloud, wine growers in Herault, France, fearing the burying of nuclear waste, consumer reluctance to genetically modified organisms, and so on. The book points to surveys that suggest scientific research appears to have lost the confidence of the people. The author's main suggestion is that policy research must properly combine what they call "indoor" and "outdoor" research, meaning that professional research and common knowledge are compatible and that they can be mutually enriching. Science and governance are linked together.

The authors focus on various experiences of public-participation methods, such as consensus conferences, or "hybrid forums," as they name them. Their

research agenda is to frame the relevant variables and understand their interactions in order to avoid the domination of a few powerful interests. In each case, the situation is designed according to the opinion of experts, politicians, and pressure groups strongly compelled by the complexity of concrete situations. Here, reality is not characterized solely by human actors; it also includes their environment, the behavior of a virus (HIV, for example), and so on. The discussion considers the best moment for participation according to the degree and nature of uncertainty at stake. Dialogue can be organized to design new problems or to reorganize research projects. The point is that here, citizens do not delegate the political decision as they traditionally do in a democracy. Rather, they contribute to the framing of the question and to the inclusion of their interests.

However, the process has to be structured to avoid becoming bogged down and violent. The authors discuss various means of focusing groups to secure an arena for discussion between the government, self-organized groups, and the media. The conditions for the emergence of this “dialogic democracy” are explored. Citizens have to conceive of their common interest, and they have to learn about the problems affecting them. The process can take time. Afterwards, they do not have to be permanently active, but they have to be present at crucial times. Thus, the authors suggest following a “cautiousness principle” whereby citizens would be invited to participate in decision-making only when there are serious dangers.

This book pioneers trying to understand the world in action through the lenses of both a political scientist and an activist. In a word, it is an attempt to cope with governance in its complexity. The authors’ perspective values the impact that organized citizens can have. Thus, it challenges traditional categories and reviews the concept of participation. This work is part of a progressive research agenda that provides a solid basis for practical and conceptual future developments.

NICOLE DE MONTRICHER, *Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique Paris II*

*Motivating Ministers to Morality.* Jenny Fleming and Ian Holland, eds. Burlington, VT: Ashgate Publishing Co., 2001. 235 pp. \$89.95 (cloth).

This edited collection is a great asset to political science and public administration, and it should be incorporated into the “must-read list” for students studying political corruption.

There are at least three good reasons for such a warm recommendation. First, the editors address a long-neglected research agenda—namely, the comparative success of the diverse institutions and procedures set up by political executives in order to encourage ethical conduct by members of the executive. The editors accept as their premise the assumption that awareness of ethical matters may be a necessary but not a sufficient condition for doing the right thing. Thereafter, they set forth to investigate the effects that mechanisms of ethical conduct have had on ministerial behavior. Classic examples of such mechanisms include doctrines of ministerial responsibility, codes of conduct, independent anticorruption agencies, and so on. The core focus of the book is thus the extent to which these mechanisms motivate ministers to do the right thing.

Second, the editors convincingly argue the case for ethical consideration of ministerial behavior. They raise the following reasons: (1) ministers are not accountable to parliament as they were once expected to be due to the erosion of

traditional mechanisms of ministerial accountability; (2) the level of power—especially discretionary powers—held by ministers puts them at a greater risk of exposure to corruption; (3) they possess an ability to hide behind Cabinet secrecy and subsequently be protected from parliamentary scrutiny and the media; (4) they have wide access to confidential material and other privileged information; (5) they have access to opinion leaders and interest groups, which may lead to potential conflicts of interests; (6) they possess the ability to select people to fill top jobs in public service, combined with their ability to design their support team, whose members often are not governed by the rules under which the rest of the civil servants operate. All in all, the editors rightly state that ministers are highly exposed to ethical dangers. The question they originally raise is the nature of institutional strategies to motivate ministers to morality and the comparative success of these mechanisms.

Third, the editors have included in their case selection a variety of mechanisms the aim of which is or has been motivating ministers to morality in different countries and at different times. In part 1, Lord Nolan speaks “from the foothills of experience” on the British case, followed by Haig Patapan, who demonstrates that a preoccupation with this topic is longstanding. In part 2, Diana Woodhouse studies the manner in which the Westminster convention of individual responsibility motivates ministers to morality, emphasizing its contingent nature and its reliance on the prime minister’s discretion. Patrick Weller then traces the emergence of Cabinet rules and asks whether these rules have had an impact on the organization and practice of political life. His argument concentrates on the importance of the prime minister as judge, jury, and executioner. Following this, Mark Shephard examines the Scottish case, which provides an example of establishing rules for political conduct in a newly established, self-governed polity. Shephard’s analysis strikes a common chord with those of Woodhouse and Weller, who also call into question the adequacy of relying solely on conventional regulation. He demonstrates that one of the advantages of written rules is that they are explicit and fixed in the short term, but with them comes the threat that these rules are amenable to change. Part 3 highlights the issue of internal regulation and the centrality of political parties. Wolfgang Seibel examines Germany’s Christian Democratic Union and the scandal of illegal party finance; Anne Tiernan investigates the role of political staffers in Australia’s “travel rorts” affair. Both demonstrate the derived consequences of dual allegiances of party functionaries to the party and to the state.

Part 4 discusses internal regulation. Robert J. Jackson examines the range of federal governmental misconduct and the efforts that have been taken to curtail corrupt behavior by ministers. Noel Preston analyzes the appointment in Australia of an ethics advisor within the Queensland government led by Premier Peter Beattie. Jenny Fleming provides an excellent comparative analysis and evaluation of anticorruption agencies in New South Wales (Independent Commission Against Corruption) and Queensland (Criminal Justice Commission). John Wanna and Alexander Gash look at the role of the Australian auditor general and assess its relevance in contemporary debates about conflict of interest and accountability. Stephen Tanner studies the relationship between the media and political executives when corrupt allegations are directed at the latter. In part 5, Charles Sampford analyzes mechanisms that provide prior advice to ministers. He argues that, when such mechanisms are supported by legal sanctions, they will motivate ministers to consider more closely the issue of ethical conduct. John Uhr studies the area of ministerial ethics from a political-theory perspective, arguing for a return to parliamentary responsibility and the institutional capacity of account-

ability agencies. In the concluding section, Ian Holland and Jenny Fleming argue that there are no simple institutional solutions. They recommend an approach relying on a variety of mechanisms to motivate ministers to morality, each contributing to the whole, but none of them sufficient on its own.

The main shortcoming of this volume is its lack of a common theoretical framework that could address the implications of political executives losing control over investigations of senior office-holders following the creation of mechanisms aimed at motivating ministers to morality. The contradiction between enhanced mechanisms aimed thus and the subsequent response by ministers has never been addressed in theoretical terms. Theoretical accounts have tended to concentrate on causes of corruption, strategies of corruption control, and their impact on government. The strong empirical insights provided in this edited volume indicate that the biggest problem in this field is the lack of an appropriate intellectual framework. Nowhere in the literature is there a systematic understanding or satisfactory approach that encompasses both political executives and anticorruption mechanisms, much less includes the role of the media in these interactions as well. Therefore, this volume is essential reading for those scholars interested in engaging in the task of developing theoretical frameworks in this field.

MOSHE MAOR, *Hebrew University of Jerusalem*